## **EXHIBIT I**

# COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO RATING SHEET FOR REVIEWING LOCAL COST DEPARTMENTAL CIP REQUESTS

| Department  Date Reviewed      |  | Address                                    | Project Description  |                 |                |            | Log#                      | Dept. Priority |
|--------------------------------|--|--|--|-----------------|----------------|------------|---------------------------|----------------|
|                                |  |  |  |                 |                |            | Proj. Type                | Cost           |
| Factor (Total Possible Points) |  | Sub-Factor                                 | Range  |                 |                | Points     | Total Score<br>per factor |                |
| 1                              | Impact on Strategic Plan   | Magnitude of impact (8)                    | From no impact = 0   | to              | High impact    | <b>= 8</b> | 0                         | 0              |
|                                | Objectives (20)  | Cost (6)                                   | From high cost = 0   | to              | Low cost       | ≃ 6        | 0                         |                |
|                                |  | Existing v. New strategy (6)               | New strategy = 3   | to              | Existing strat |            | 0                         |                |
| 2                              | Service Impact (10)  |  | From a new, expanded or i  | mproved servic  | e              | = 3        | 0                         | 0              |
|                                |  |  | To maintain existing service   | es              |                | Up to 10   |                           |                |
|                                |  |  | No significant impact  |                 |                | = 0        | <u> </u>                  |                |
|                                | Customer Spending<br>Preferences (10)  |  | Up to 10, based on spending level preference and customer rating of department services as Very Important, and adjusting for differences between internal service department surveys and line department surveys (see formula attached). |                 |                |            | N/A                       | 0              |
|                                | Customer Confidence in<br>Performance (10)   | Value for the dollar (5)                   | Up to 5, based on % of customers rating Department's services as a good/excellent value, adjusting for differences between internal department surveys and telephone surveys (see formula on back)                                       |                 |                |            | 0                         | 0              |
|                                |  | Quality (5)                                | Up to 5, based on % of customers rating Department's services as a good/excellent quality, adjusting for differences between internal department surveys and telephone surveys (see formula on back)                                     |                 |                |            | N/A                       |                |
|                                | Increases Productivity,<br>Reduces Operation and<br>Maintenance Costs, Avoids<br>costs, or Generates New<br>Revenue )15) | Return on Investment (ROI)<br>over 3 years | From 15% increase on RO  | [= 1 to         | 75%+           | = 15       | 0                         | 0              |
|                                | Increases On-Going Costs   |  | Deduct from 1 - 15 points f  | or increases in | on-going costs |            | 0                         |                |
| 6                              | Specific Federal/State   | Consequences of non-                       | From none = 0  | to              | High           | = 10       | 0                         | 0              |
|                                | mandates, Health/Safety<br>Liability/Risk Issues or Prior  | compliance (10) Cost of Compliance (5)     | From high cost = 0   | to              | Low cost       | = 5        | <u> </u>                  |                |
| <del></del>                    | Other General Fund or Other  | Cost of Compliance (0)                     | 100% Local Cost  | 10              | 2011 0001      | = 0        | 0                         | 0              |
| 1                              | Funding Source (10)  |  | Funding covers up to 35% of total cost = 3   |                 |                |            | 1                         |                |
|                                | Tanang Course (10)   |  | Funding covers 36-74% of   |                 |                | = 6        |                           |                |
|                                |  |  | Funding covers >75%  |                 |                | ± 10       | 1                         |                |
| 8                              | Departmental Priority (10)   |  | Departmental's top ranked requested item = 10 points 2nd ranked = 7, 3rd = 4, 4th = 1  |                 |                |            | 0                         | 0              |
|                                | Total Score (Total Possible = 100)   |  | 210 (01)00 - 7, 00 0 7, 70   |                 |                |            |                           | 0              |

Page 2 of 2

#### **RATING SHEET (Cont'd)**

<u>Purpose:</u> The purpose of this form is to provide the CIP Review Team with a means for prioritizing Department CIP requests using explicit criteria. These criteria are made known to Departments prior to the submission of their requests to the CIP Review Team.

**EXHIBIT I** 

#### **Guidelines:**

- 1. The forms will be used for evaluating CIP requests for local funding of projects in excess of \$5,000.
- 2. The highest possible score for each request that is evaluated with these forms is 100. The higher the individual score, the higher it ranks in competing for available resources.
- The CIP Review Team will not prepare a rating form for requests that are fully funded from other funding sources.

Summary of the Formulas Used for Two Factors Used As Criteria For Reviewing Department CIP Requests

#### **Customer Spending Preferences**

Step 1: Compute the percentage difference between the averages of the telephone survey and the internal point of service survey in order to equalize surveys.

Step 2: On the survey response for the Department relative to Importance of the Services, multiply the Department's percentage for "Very Important" times the Department's percentage on the "Spend more, or the same..." survey question. The factor used from the "Spend more, or the same..." question is the sum of the percentage scores the Department received for "Spend More" plus "Spend the Same".

Step 3: The product which is the result in Step 2 is then multiplied by 10, which is the point maximum for this question. This product becomes the total score for the Customer Spending Preference factor.

## **Customer Confidence in Performance**

## Value for the Dollar

Step 1: Compute the percentage difference between the averages of the telephone survey and the internal point of service survey in order to equalize surveys.

Step 2: On the survey response for the Department relative to "Value of the Service", multiply the sum of the Department's percentages for "Good" plus "Excellent" times by 5, which is the point maximum for this question. This product becomes the total score for the Value for the Dollar factor.

## Quality

From the point of service survey, multiply the sum of the Department's percentages for "Good" plus "Excellent" times 5, which is the maximum for this question. This product becomes the total score for the Quality factor.

